UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/551,899	04/19/2000	Harri Rajala	0544MH-34056(RM 143)	3555

5073 7590 04/10/2003

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
PILLAI, NAMITHA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	13

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/551,899	Applicant(s) RAJALA ET AL.	
	Examiner Namitha Pillai	Art Unit 2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *1/21/2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-6,8 and 10-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 January 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed September 6, 2001 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the dates are missing for the publications. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because it is not clear what reference number 110 are referring to in Figure 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Both claims refer to a "program" which can be rendered as non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8 and 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,330,007 B1 (Isreal et al.) and U. S. Patent No. 6,104,392 (Shaw et al.).

Referring to claim 1, Isreal discloses a system for communicating transaction information between a Seller and a plurality of Buyers over a distributed data processing system. The graphical user interfaces that are created and displayed as seen in Figure 7 clearly depict a means for communicating transaction information between a host and various client systems. Isreal also discloses a database that is used for managing the plurality of user interface metadata elements (column 1, lines 63-65 and column 2, lines 23-25), and as seen in Figure 5, this metadata includes component identifications and component properties. Isreal also has a visual rule model using dialog boxes for configuring a plurality of graphical user interface dialog pages (Figures 4-6), utilizing the metadata and a plurality of dialog rules, wherein the metadata are pointed out by reference number 540 in Figure 5 and the dialog rules pertain to reference numbers 520-530 in Figure 5, used for creating graphical user interfaces. Isreal also does disclose a dialog manager used to create the graphical user interfaces based on the metadata elements (Figure 5) and dynamically create a plurality of graphical user interface screens in the distributed data processing systems in order to allow communication of

information between the Seller and the plurality of Buyers related to the transaction (column 1, lines 5-10). Isreal does not disclose a plurality of rendering engines for responding to the creation of graphical user interfaces based on a distinct programming language. Shaw discloses a plurality of rendering engines adapted to respond to the client's request by constructing graphical user interfaces screens in different languages (reference numbers 52, 54, 56 and 58, Figure 1, column 5, lines 55-60). Shaw clearly states that a means for selecting the relevant rendering engines is based on the communication channel between a client and server (column 1, lines 31-37 and column 8, lines 14-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Isreal's invention such that the communication channel of the client system is considered and the graphical user interface screens were rendered based on this information. Shaw discloses that in networks where there are various clients connecting to one server, these clients will have varying capabilities as far as the bandwidth is concerned (column 1, lines 32-35). Isreal has a transaction system, wherein various clients will connect to one server and these clients will have varying bandwidth capabilities. In order to allow for unique performance of these varied clients, rendering techniques using certain protocols allows for the display of graphical user interfaces based on the bandwidth of the client's connection, as taught by Shaw. Hence, one skilled in the art would be motivated to learn from Shaw to use a plurality of rendering engines which will create a plurality of graphical user interfaces in different programming languages based on the communication channel of a client.

Referring to claims 2, 6, 12, 15 and 18, Shaw discloses that the language of one rendering engine comprises hypertext mark-up language (column 5, lines 57-60).

Referring to claims 4, 8, 11, 16 and 19, Shaw discloses using relatively low bandwidth communication channel such as an Internet connection for communicating (column 2, lines 9-15).

Referring to claims 5, 14 and 17, Isreal discloses a system for communicating transaction information between a Seller and a plurality of Buyers over a distributed data processing system. The graphical user interfaces that are created and displayed as seen in Figure 7 clearly depict a means for communicating transaction information between a host and various client systems. Isreal also discloses that a database is used for managing the plurality of user interface metadata elements (column 1, lines 63-65 and column 2, lines 23-25), and as seen in Figure 5, this metadata includes component identifications and component properties for the user interface for a transaction. Isreal also does disclose a dialog manager used to create the graphical user interfaces based on the metadata elements (Figure 5) and dynamically create a plurality of graphical user interface screens in the distributed data processing systems in order to allow communication of information between the Seller and the plurality of Buyers related to the transaction (column 1, lines 5-10). Isreal discloses that during interaction in a transaction system, the dialog manager as seen in Figure 5, is used to pass the metadata from a database (reference numbers 510 and 540, Figure 5) to dynamically construct a series of graphical user interface screens which include active and passive portions for presenting a plurality of product options to the customer and to record the customer's selection (Figure 7). Isreal does not disclose a plurality of rendering engines for responding to the creation of graphical user interfaces based on a distinct programming language. Shaw discloses establishing a low bandwidth communication channel between

server and client (column 8, lines 28-29). Shaw discloses a plurality of rendering engines adapted to respond to the client's request by constructing graphical user interfaces screens in different languages (reference numbers 52, 54, 56 and 58, Figure 1, column 5, lines 55-60). Shaw clearly states that a means for selecting the relevant rendering engines is based on the communication channel between a client and server (column 1, lines 31-37 and column 8, lines 14-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Isreal's invention such that the communication channel of the client system is considered and the graphical user interface screens were rendered based on this information. Shaw discloses that in networks where there are various clients connecting to one server, these clients will have varying capabilities as far as the bandwidth is concerned (column 1, lines 32-35). Isreal has a transaction system, wherein various clients will connect to one server and these clients will have varying bandwidth capabilities. In order to allow for unique performance of these varied clients, rendering techniques using certain protocols allows for the display of graphical user interfaces based on the bandwidth of the client's connection, as taught by Shaw. Hence, one skilled in the art would be motivated to learn from Shaw to use a plurality of rendering engines which will create a plurality of graphical user interfaces in different programming languages based on the communication channel of a client.

Referring to claim 10, Isreal discloses a system for communicating transaction information between a Seller and a plurality of Buyers over a distributed data processing system. The graphical user interfaces that are created and displayed as seen in Figure 7 clearly depict a means for communicating transaction information between a host and various client systems. Isreal discloses communication between the client system and a

server through a low bandwidth communication channel (column 6, lines 36-44). Isreal also discloses a database is used for managing the plurality of user interface metadata elements (column 1, lines 63-65 and column 2, lines 23-25), and as seen in Figure 5, this metadata includes component identifications and component properties for the user interface for a transaction. Isreal discloses that authors, who are part of the Sellers, are the ones creating the user interfaces, thus them having control of the metadata and the dialog manager, which are used to create these graphical user interfaces (column 5, lines 17-18). Isreal also does disclose a dialog manager used to create the graphical user interfaces based on the metadata elements (Figure 5) and dynamically create a plurality of graphical user interface screens in the distributed data processing systems in order to allow communication of information between the Seller and the plurality of Buyers related to the transaction (column 1, lines 5-10). Isreal discloses that during interaction in a transaction system, the dialog manager as seen in Figure 5, is used to pass the metadata from a database (reference numbers 510 and 540, Figure 5) to dynamically construct a series of graphical user interface screens which include active and passive portions for presenting a plurality of product options to the customer and to record the customer's selection (Figure 7). As seen in Figure 7 of Isreal, the transaction information is passed to the Buyer in the form of graphical user interface screens, which confine particular relevant portions of metadata (Figure 7). As seen in Figure 7 of Isreal, there is a means for receiving transaction information, by selecting a dynakey, picking from a list or entering a list number as directed by directions on the screen itself, from the Buyer by monitoring the interaction between the Buyer and the graphical user interface screens (Figure 7). Isreal does not disclose a plurality of rendering engines for responding to the

creation of graphical user interfaces based on a distinct programming language. Shaw discloses establishing a low bandwidth communication channel between server and client (column 8, lines 28-29). Shaw discloses a plurality of rendering engines adapted to respond to the client's request by constructing graphical user interfaces screens in different languages (reference numbers 52, 54, 56 and 58, Figure 1, column 5, lines 55-60). Shaw clearly states that a means for selecting the relevant rendering engines is based on the communication channel between a client and server (column 1, lines 31-37 and column 8, lines 14-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Isreal's invention such that the communication channel of the client system is considered and the graphical user interface screens were rendered based on this information. Shaw discloses that in networks where there are various clients connecting to one server, these clients will have varying capabilities as far as the bandwidth is concerned (column 1, lines 32-35). Isreal has a transaction system, wherein various clients will connect to one server and these clients will have varying bandwidth capabilities. In order to allow for uniform performance of these varied clients, rendering techniques using certain protocols allows for the display of graphical user interfaces based on the bandwidth of the client's connection, as taught by Shaw. Hence, one skilled in the art would be motivated to learn from Shaw to use a plurality of rendering engines which will create a plurality of graphical user interfaces in different programming languages based on the communication channel of a client.

Referring to claim 13, Shaw discloses establishing a low bandwidth communication channel between server and client (column 8, lines 28-29).

Response to Claim Changes

5. The Examiner acknowledges the Applicant's amendment by adding new information to narrow the scope of claims 1, 2, 5, 10 and the addition of new claims 13-19. However this change is still rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over the inventions disclosed.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/21/2003 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument that Isreal and Hitchcock do not teach a plurality of rendering engines adapted to respond to commands from the visual rule model and each further operable to construct a plurality of graphical user interface screens in a different language" or "a dialog manager operable to select one of the plurality of rendering engines based on each Buyer's communication channel". However, the claims along with this new addition have been overcome by the prior art Isreal and Shaw, disclosed in the rejection above.

With respect to applicant's request that the Examiner provide a reference that supports using a JAVA rendering engine. Shaw discloses a JAVA rendering engine, used for creating a graphical user interface with the JAVA programming language (reference number 56, Figure 1).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Namitha Pillai whose telephone number is (703) 305-7691. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7238 for regular communications and (703) 746-7240 for After Final Communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Namitha Pillai
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2173
March 31, 2003

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173